

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
JAN 12 2009

Appellants' Brief on Appeal
S/N 10/785,227
Docket: YOR920040028US1 (YOR.511)

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

In re Application of: Samuel S. Adams et al.

Serial No.: 10/785,227

Group Art Unit: 2443

Filed: February 25, 2004

Examiner: K. G. Belani

For: METHOD AND STRUCTURE FOR AUTOMATED LAYOUT
DIRECTOR

Commissioner of Patents
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

APPELLANTS' BRIEF ON APPEAL

Sir:

Appellants respectfully appeal the rejection of claims 1-15 in the Office Action mailed on July 2, 2008.

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest is International Business Machines Corporation, assignee of 100% interest of the above-referenced patent application.

II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There are no other appeals or interferences known to Appellants, Appellants' legal representative or Assignee which would directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in this appeal.

Docket YOR920040028US1(YOR.511)

Appellants' Brief on Appeal
S/N: 10/785,227

III. STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,953,050 to Kamata et al. Claims 1, 2, and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over US Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0162877 to Van Dok et al, further in view of US Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0161090 to Digate et al. Claims 3-7, 9, and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Van Dok/Digate, further yet in view of Kamata. Claims 8 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Van Dok/Digate, further yet in view of US Patent No. 6,018,346. Claims 12 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Kamata, further in view of Digate.

Appellants respectfully appeal all of these rejections identified above.

IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

The Examiner refused entry of the after-final Amendment filed on August 18, 2008, as allegedly raising a new issue even though the amendment merely incorporated contents of an existing dependent claim into independent claims.

V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

Bases in the specification for the independent claims:

1. (Rejected) A method of providing a composite data feed for an online meeting (see Figures 3, 6, and 8-11; lines 12-15 of page 7), said method comprising at least one of:
providing a capability (Figs. 2, 5, 6) for at least one participant node in said online meeting to input a layout rule for a customized composite image of said online meeting to be seen specifically at said at least one participant node (step 702 of Figure 7; lines 19-23 of page 7, lines 9-12 of page 8, lines 16-17 of page 16); and

Docket YOR920040028US1 (YOR.511)

Appellants' Brief on Appeal
S/N: 10/785,227

receiving a layout rule defining a composite image of said online meeting that can be customized for at least one participant node in said online meeting (step 703 of Figure 7; lines 19-23 of page 7, lines 9-12 of page 8).

2. (Rejected) The method of claim 1, wherein said layout rule comprises a Boolean combination of conditions (see Figure 8-11, wherein resultant sizes, locations, constitute application of various Boolean combinations; lines 1-7 of page 14, lines 5-11 of page 20, lines 12-19 of page 21, lines 15-21 of page 22).

3. (Rejected) The method of claim 1, further comprising:

receiving data feeds from a plurality of nodes included in said online meeting (step 703 of Figure 7); and

calculating a composite data feed image for said at least one participant node, said composite data feed image complying with said layout rule (steps 704-707 of Figure 7; lines 9-12 of page 8, lines 16-17 of page 16).

4. (Rejected) The method of claim 1, wherein said layout rule specifies at least one of (see Figures 8-11 for examples):

a size of a display pane in said composite image of a given feed involved in said online meeting (lines 16-17 of page 14);

a relative size of said display pane of said given feed (lines 9-12 of page 8, lines 16-17 of page 14);

a position of said display pane of said given feed (lines 9-12 of page 8, lines 18-21 of page 14);

a relative position of said display pane of said given feed (lines 9-12 of page 8, lines 18-21 of page 14);

whether said given feed is included in said composite image (lines 12-17 of page 11, lines 17-20 of page 15);

how frequently said layout rule is to be checked for updates (lines 13-14 of page 8, lines 3-5 of page 15);

Docket YOR920040028US1 (YOR.511)

Appellants' Brief on Appeal
S/N: 10/785,227

how aggressively (lines 14-16 of page 8) a layout specification of said layout rule should be executed in terms of a range of whether said composite image includes only moderately different sized displays or only one maximally large display with all other displays being maximally small;

a status of an owner of said given feed (lines 1-2 of page 8, line 4 and lines 14-15 of page 14, lines 6-7 of page 15); and

a type of said given feed (line 2 of page 8).

5. (Rejected) The method of claim 1, further comprising:

transmitting (step 707, Fig. 7, 209 of Figs 2 and 4, 1234 of Fig 12, lines 1-2 of page 17) said composite data feed image for display on a display device (1238 of Fig 12, lines 10-11 of page 19).

6. (Rejected) The method of claim 3, wherein said calculating is accomplished at a server remote from said at least one participant node (102, 103 of Fig 1, line 8 of page 10 through line 17 of page 12).

7. (Rejected) The method of claim 3, wherein said calculating is accomplished at one of said at least one participant node's location (lines 20-22 of page 24).

8. (Rejected) The method of claim 1, wherein said receiving said layout rule is periodically checked so that said at least one participant node is able to revise (lines 20-22 of page 3, lines 13-14 of page 12) said layout rule until one of:

said at least one participant node exits said online meeting (line 5 and lines 12-13 of page 12, lines 1-2 of page 19); and

said online meeting terminates (lines 1-2 and 18-21 of page 19).

Docket YOR920040028US1 (YOR.511)

Appellants' Brief on Appeal
S/N: 10/785,227

9. (Rejected) The method of claim 3, wherein said calculating the data feed includes at least one of:

an amount of audio activity, including a number of different speakers (lines 2-4 of page 8); and

a level of video activity, including at least one of an amount of overall movement and a number of moving figures (lines 2-8 of page 8, lines 8-12 of page 14).

10. (Rejected) The method of claim 3, said method further having at least one of the following capabilities:

said receiving of data feeds is from one or more distinct network types (lines 12-14 of page 9);

at least one node in said online meeting can serve as a data feed source (lines 10-13 of page 18);

said at least one participant node is able to specify a personal weighting preference to be used in said calculating (lines 16-17 of page 14);

a display for at least one input feed does not change (104 of Fig 1, lines 18-22 of page 9);

said at least one participant node is able to change said layout rules during a given online meeting (line 1 of page 19);

said at least one participant node is able to have at least some rules in said layout rules specified by another user, in addition to the rules said at least one participant node specifies (lines 3-9 of page 13); and

a given set of layout rules can be applied to more than one said at least one participant node (lines 3-9 of page 13).

11. (Rejected) A method of providing a composite data feed for an online meeting (see Figures 8-11), said method comprising:

calculating a composite image of said online meeting that is to be seen uniquely at a participant node (208 of Figs 2 and 4, 706 of Fig 7, lines 9-12 of page 8), wherein a

Docket YOR920040028US1 (YOR.511)

Appellants' Brief on Appeal
S/N: 10/785,227

layout rule for said calculating said composite image can be dynamically changed during a course of said online meeting (lines 20-22 of page 3, line 6 of page 12).

12. (Rejected) An apparatus comprising at least one of:

a graphical user interface (1222, 1236 of Fig 12, lines 12-17 of page 13, line 17 of page 18 through line 2 of page 19) to allow a participant node in an online meeting to provide a layout rule set for a customized composite image of said online meeting that is to be seen at said participant node (see Figures 8-11);

a receiver (1234 of Fig 12) to receive a layout rule set that defines a customized composite image to be presented to a participant node in an online meeting (lines 15-16 of page 19); and

a calculator (1211 of Fig 12) to calculate a customized composite image to be presented to a participant node in an online meeting, said calculator receiving a plurality of feeds related to said online meeting and calculating said customized composite image in accordance with a layout rule set that defines a composite image to specifically be presented to said participant node (lines 9-12 of page 8, lines 16-19 of page 19).

13. (Rejected) A system (100 of Fig 1) comprising:

a first participant node (102 of Fig 1);

at least one of a second participant node (103 of Fig 1) and a data feed node (104 of Fig 1); and

a network (105 of Fig 1) interconnecting said first participant node to said at least one of a second participant node and a data feed, said network thereby providing an online meeting including said first participant node,

wherein said first participant node receives a customized composite image of said online meeting that is calculated in accordance with a layout rule that defines a composite image to be presented specifically to said first participant node (see Figures 8-11, lines 19-23 of page 7).

Docket YOR920040028US1 (YOR.511)

14. (Rejected) A service (lines 3-5 of page 25) comprising at least one of:

conducting an online meeting in which any or all nodes participating in said online meeting receives a composite image of said online meeting that is potentially customized for each said node, wherein at least one of a size and a layout of subpanes of the composite image are controlled by user-specified rules (see Figures 8-11; lines 6-10 of page 25);

operating one of said nodes in said online meeting in which said customized composite images are possible (lines 6-10 of page 25);

calculating a composite image in said online meeting (lines 6-10 of page 25);

providing a facility for said online meeting, said facility comprising at least one of a hardware or software component to be used in one of said nodes and at least one of a hardware or software component to be used in calculating a composite image in said online meeting (lines 6-10 of page 25);

providing a maintenance for said facility for said online meeting (lines 8-10 of page 25); and

providing a training for at least one of using and operating said online meeting or said facility (lines 16-19 of page 25).

15. (Rejected) A signal-bearing medium (1300 of Fig 13) tangibly embodying a program of machine-readable instructions executable by a digital processing apparatus to perform a method of providing a composite data feed for an online meeting, said method comprising at least one of:

providing a capability (Figs. 2, 5, 6) for at least one participant node in said online meeting to input a layout rule for a customized composite image of said online meeting to be seen specifically at said at least one participant node (step 702 of Figure 7; lines 19-23 of page 7, lines 9-12 of page 8, lines 16-17 of page 16); and

receiving a layout rule defining a composite image of said online meeting that can be customized for at least one participant node in said online meeting (step 703 of Figure 7; lines 19-23 of page 7, lines 9-12 of page 8).

VI. GROUND OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

Appellants present the following grounds for review by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences:

GROUND 1: The 35 USC §101 rejection for claim 15;

GROUND 2: The Anticipation Rejection for Claim 14, based on Kamata et al;

GROUND 3: The Obviousness Rejection for Claim 1 and 15, based on Van Dok et al, further in view of Digate et al;

GROUND 4: The Obviousness Rejection for Claim 2, based on Van Dok/Digate;

GROUND 5: The Obviousness Rejection for Claims 3-7, 9, and 10, based on Van Dok/Digate, further yet in view of Kamata;

GROUND 6: The Obviousness Rejection for Claim 10, based on Van Dok/Digate, further yet in view of Kamata;

GROUND 7: The Obviousness Rejection for Claims 8 and 11, based Van Dok/Digate, further yet in view of Moran et al; and

GROUND 8: The Obviousness Rejection for Claims 12 and 13, based on Kamata/Digate.

THIS PAGE BLANK (USPTO)